

Ser. No. 10/713,641

Remarks

Claims 1-22 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 17, and 19 were rejected. Claims 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 16, and 18 were merely objected to and claims 12-15 and 20-22 were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, no claims are canceled, no claims are amended, and claims 23-26 are added. No new matter is presented.

Advisory Action

Regarding the previously-submitted amendments to claims 1 and 9, the Advisory Action indicated that the proposed amendments "would raise new issues..." Accordingly, these claims are re-presented for consideration.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in as-filed claims 2-4, 7, 8, 10, 12-15, and 20-22.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 17 and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Honda et al. U.S. Patent 6,092,987. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As noted above, Applicants request reconsideration of claims 1 and 9 and the claims dependent thereupon in view of the amendment and arguments filed November 9, 2005. The new claims are discussed below.

In the April 7, 2005 Office action, the asserted claimed structural case was referenced by Honda et al. numerals 40 and 42 and the aft and fore joints marked with letters E and F. These letters point to areas where the Honda et al. housing 42 is sealed to an adjacent shroud ring but not secured thereto (see the beginning of paragraph 0021/23 of the application/publication). This lack of securing was believed to not satisfy the claimed structural role. Claims 1 and 9 identify "securing" which has already been addressed in various dependent claims (e.g., claim 16 which further specifies bolted joints). Honda et al. does not disclose or suggest such securing.

Ser. No. 10/713,641

New claim 23 identifies the bleed ports as ports into the bleed plenum and identifies an outboard plenum. Support for this is found at paragraph 0020 of the application (0022 of the PGPub.) and element 114 in the drawings. The Interview Summary dated November 16, 2005 indicated that further relative clarification "such as a flow direction" was sought relative to the examiner's initial interpretation (an alternative interpretation identified in the Interview Summary is discussed below). Claim 23 achieves this in one way by also identifying an outboard plenum to which the ports from the bleed plenum lead. Claim 24 (discussed below) contains an alternative characterization of the relative positions.

Regarding the alternative interpretation identified in the Interview Summary, Applicants submit that that would not constitute a plenum having both a plurality of bleed ports and a plurality of valve ports. The alternative interpretation would create a plurality of individual passageways not connected to each other and thereby not forming a plenum. This argument may further be instructive regarding the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections below.

New claim 24 identifies a bleed flowpath and relative upstream and downstream positions of the bleed ports and the valve ports. Support for this is found at paragraph 0020 of the application (0022 of the PGPub.) and element 506 in the drawings.

New claim 25 identifies the bleed plenum as a common annular bleed plenum. Support for this is found at paragraph 0016 of the application (0018 of the PGPub.). As noted above, under the examiner's alternative interpretation, a plurality of individual passageways/conduits would not constitute a plenum let alone a common annular bleed plenum.

New claim 26 further identifies bleed offtake ducts. Support for this is found at paragraph 0016 of the application (0018 of the PGPub.) and element 56 in the drawings. There is further no suggestion for the bleed offtake ducts having the claimed relationship to the bleed plenum.

Claims Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chlus U.S. Patent 6,802,691 in view of Honda et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The rejection is believed overcome for the same reasons as is the 102(b) rejection. The examiner identified element 20 of Chlus as the structural case. However, there is no suggestion

Ser. No. 10/713,641

for the claimed bleed plenum.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. in view of Malmborg U.S. PGPub. 2005/0008486. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.


Malmborg was apparently cited for "having a compressor with a structural case 76 that carries fan exit guide vanes 77..." Office action, page 8. It is not clear whether this is intended to replace the structural case of Honda et al. as it is differently positioned. It is clear from FIG. 2 of Malmborg that the element having the valve ports (above the reference numeral 84) is in floating relation to the shroud sealed by O-rings as is Honda et al. Accordingly, neither Malmborg, Honda et al., nor their combination suggest the claimed bleed plenum.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda et al. in view of Chlus and further in view of Malmborg. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office action included a repeated discussion of Malmborg. As noted above, however, even if the combination were proper it fails to suggest the claimed bleed plenum.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance. Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
William B. Slate
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628

Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: December 9, 2005

F:\Patents\2003\03-539\03-539 3rd Amdt.doc